

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-15, 17-52, 56-66, and 68-103 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 27, 52, 78, and 103 being independent. Claims 1, 7-9, 13, 27-34, 38, 52, 58-60, 64, 78-85, 89, and 103 have been amended, and claims 2-4, 16, 53-55, and 67 have previously been cancelled. Support for the amendments is found at, for example, pages 5, lines 5-15, and Fig. 7. No new matter has been introduced.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claims 1 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a non-statutory matter. While Applicant believes that the claims as originally presented are directed to statutory subject matter, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 27 to recite “[a] computer-implemented method.” Accordingly, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boylan in view of Dedrick.

Claims 1, 5-15, 17-26, 28, 30-52, 56-66, 68-77, 79, and 81-103 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boylan (U.S. Patent No. 6,799,326) in view of Dedrick (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,521). Applicant respectfully asserts that neither the relied upon portions of Boylan, Dedrick, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests the features of the amended independent claims.

Claim 1 has been amended and recites, *inter alia*, a computer-implemented method for blocking advertisements. A document to which an ad is linked is identified and content in the document is analyzed. Based on analyzing the content in the document, at least one entry is identified, and the entry is added to the blocking category of ads to be blocked if the entry relates to the least one blocking category of ads to be blocked. An ad is prevented from being served if at least a predetermined number of its at least one descriptive category match any of the at least one blocking category of ads to be blocked. The at least one descriptive category associated with the ad is determined from the content of the document. Neither Boylan or Dedrick, alone or in

combination, describes or suggests, “identifying, based on analyzing the content in the document linked to by the ad, at least one entry ... [and] adding the entry to the blocking category of ads to be blocked if the entry relates to the least one blocking category of ads to be blocked.”

Boylan describes how an interactive set top box locally inserts video streams on a user's set top box. See, e.g., Abstract. Because Boylan is directed to set top boxes, and in recognition of Boylan's admitted failure to describe or suggest “preventing an ad from being served if at least a predetermined number of its at least one blocking category match any of the at least one blocking category of ads to be blocked, wherein the at least one descriptive category associated with the ad is determined from the content of the document linked to by the ad,” the Examiner turns to Dedrick, noting “Boylan does not explicitly disclose a document linked to by an ad. However, Dedrick discloses a document linked to by an ad (column 2, lines 1-20).”

Reliance on Dedrick is similarly misplaced. Dedrick describes how a user profile is developed. See Col. 3, lines 5-27. The user profile is directed to individual user characteristics. See, e.g., Abstract. An advertiser then uses a consumer scale to model how advertisements should be placed. See Col. 4, line-Col. 5, line 3. Specifically, the consumer scale describes an ideal profile for a user that would be targeted by an advertisement. See Col. 5, lines 20-27. The consumer scale matching process then analyzes the user profile and the consumer scale to determine whether a particular user described by the user profile represents a desirable placement for an advertisement. See Col. 5, lines 20-65. Dedrick notes in block 206 that the advertising title, the profile target data, and the consumer scale are downloaded, and that in blocks 208-212, the metering server determines whether the consumers have characteristics that correlate to the targeted profile data. See Col. 18, lines 25-55.


However, Applicant respectfully asserts that the relied upon portion of Dedrick is entirely silent about blocking advertisements. As such, Dedrick fails to describe or suggest, “identifying, based on analyzing the content in the document linked to by the ad, at least one entry ... [and] adding the entry to the category of ads to be blocked if the entry relates to the least one blocking category of ads to be blocked.” None of the other references describe or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, allowance of independent claim 1, and its dependent claims, is respectfully requested. Independent claims 52 and 103 recite similar limitations and should be allowed for similar reasons. Claims 27 has been amended and now recites “identifying, based on comparing

the document to the at least one ad, the at least one ad as a candidate ad ... analyzing the candidate ad using the at least one blocking category of ads to be blocked [and] ... determining, based on analyzing the candidate ad using the at least one blocking category of ads to be blocked, that the candidate ad should not be blocked.” Because Dedrick fails to describe blocking advertisements, Dedrick also fails to describe the limitations of amended independent claim 27. Amended claim 78, although reciting a different limitation, still differs from the teachings of Boylan and Dedrick for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, allowance of independent claims 27 and 78, and their dependent claims, is respectfully requested.

No fee is believed to be due for the filing of this paper on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/30/2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas A. Rozylowicz  
Reg. No. 50,620

**Customer No. 26192**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945